

Remarks / Arguments

Claims 1-20 have been canceled, without prejudice, and new claims 21-35 have been presented.

Claim 21 finds support, in part, in original claim 1. The limitation of "in both the change state and the normal state, starting a write filter that intercepts writes to the protected memory locations and stores the writes in a write cache" finds support, at least, in paragraphs [0027] and [0033] of the published application. The limitation of, "setting the indication that data needs to be persisted to the protected memory locations" finds support, at least, in paragraph [0029] of the published application. The limitation of "before re-entering the change state or the normal state, rebooting the embedded system" finds support, at least, in FIG. 3.

Claim 24 finds support, at least, in paragraphs [0031] and [0034] of the published application, as well as in original claim 4.

Claim 25 finds support, at least, in paragraph [0034] of the published application.

Claims 30 and 31 find support, at least, in original claims 10 and 11, and in paragraphs [0027], [0031], [0033] and [0034] of the published application.

Other amendments to the claims find support both in the original claims and in various parts of the application.

None of the amendments to the claims are believed to add new matter.

1. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-16 and 18-20 **Under 35 USC 102(a) and 102(e)**

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Page (US Pat. No. 6,523,103).

Given that claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-16 and 18-20 have been canceled, this rejection is moot.

New claims 21-35 are believed patentable over Page, at least, because Page does not disclose "starting a write filter that intercepts writes to the protected memory

locations and stores the writes in a write cache" in both the PREPBOOT (or COMPLETEBOOT) and RUNBOOT states.

2. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page (US Pat. No. 6,523,103) in view of Ryan (US Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0084194).

Given that claim 2 has been canceled, this rejection is moot.

New claims 21-35 are believed patentable over the combined teachings of Page and Ryan, at least, because Page and Ryan do not disclose "starting a write filter that intercepts writes to the protected memory locations and stores the writes in a write cache" in both the PREPBOOT (or COMPLETEBOOT) and RUNBOOT states.

3. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Page (US Pat. No. 6,523,103) in view of Xian et al. (US Pat. No. 6,327,584; hereinafter "Xian").

Given that claim 7 has been canceled, this rejection is moot.

New claims 21-35 are believed patentable over the combined teachings of Page and Xian, at least, because Page and Xian do not disclose "starting a write filter that intercepts writes to the protected memory locations and stores the writes in a write cache" in both the PREPBOOT (or COMPLETEBOOT) and RUNBOOT states.

4. Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLAND & HART, LLP

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregory W. Osterloth', is written over a horizontal line.

Gregory W. Osterloth
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 295-8205